Commets of Reviewer #2

[General Comment] The article is an interesting study and is of current interest in the field of acoustics. This is a worthwhile piece of research in terms of technical aspects and addresses some important aspects in acoustic theory. The simulations seem to be valid and significant to understand the research. However, the article is poorly drafted, losing the actual essence of the investigation made in it. Therefore, I would suggest revising the article thoroughly thereby improving the presentation considerably.

Response: Thank you very much for agreeing with us to the intention of this manuscript. We have read your comments carefully and tried our best to address them one by one, especially in presentation. We went through the entire manuscript to eliminate grammar and spelling mistakes. We hope that the manuscript has been improved towards your standards after this revision. (because the language and grammar have been greatly revised, most of the text is highlighted, but the theme and core of the article have not been modified)

[Comment 1] The first sentence of abstract is incomplete. This shows a careless attitude while drafting the article. Further, the abstract lacks consistency and precision in terms of its contents. I would suggest to completely revise the abstract with a brief statement about the purpose and scope of the study, describe the research methods used and provide a summary of the results by keeping it concise and to the point, typically between 150 and 250 words. Also, use clear and concise language, avoiding technical jargon and abbreviations whenever possible and to be sure that the abstract accurately reflects the content of the article. Remember, the abstract is often the first thing readers will see, so it's important to make it engaging and informative.

Response: Thank you for your feedback. We have taken your comments into consideration and have revised the abstract to address the issues you raised. The revised abstract provides a clear statement about the purpose and scope of our study, describes the research methods we used, and summarizes the results in a concise and precise manner. We have also ensured that the language used is clear and that the abstract accurately reflects the content of our article. We understand the importance of the abstract as the first point of contact with the reader, and we have strived to make it engaging and informative. We hope the revised abstract meets your expectations and thank you again for your valuable feedback.

[Comment 2] In keywords, adopt the uniform format setting, e, g; to Capitalize Each Word.

Response: Thank you for your feedback. We have revised the keywords section to adopt the uniform format setting by capitalizing each word, as you suggested. We appreciate your valuable input and hope that the revised manuscript meets your expectations.

[Comment 3] At various parts of the article, it appears that the font and format are varied unnecessarily. It is important to use a consistent format and font size throughout the article.

Response: Thanks for your kind reminder. We have carefully reviewed the article and have made necessary revisions to ensure a consistent format and font size throughout the manuscript. We have standardized the font size of the main text to 10.5 point and also made the titles and subtitles consistent.

[Comment 4] Conclusion section is very poorly drafted. This sounds like an abstract. When writing the conclusion, avoid introducing new information or repeating information already covered in the article. Instead, focus on providing a concise summary of the study's key findings and their significance. Do discuss the implications and significance of the findings, including how they contribute to the existing knowledge in the field. Also, address any limitations or weaknesses of the study, and suggest areas for future research. Include an effective final statement that emphasizes the importance and relevance of the study, and potentially its broader implications.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have completely revised the conclusion section of the article to address the issues you raised.

1. We have made sure to avoid introducing new information or repeating information already covered in the article, and have provided a concise summary of the study's key findings and their significance. 2. We have also discussed the implications and significance of the findings, including how they contribute to the existing knowledge in the field, as well as addressed the limitations or weaknesses of the study and suggested areas for future research.
3. Finally, we have included an effective comparison that emphasizes the importance and relevance of the study, and potentially its broader implications.

We appreciate your valuable feedback and hope the revised conclusion meets your expectations.

[Comment 5] Proofread the whole article carefully for grammar and spelling errors.

Response: Thank you very much for pointing this out. We have carefully proofread the entire article for grammar and spelling errors and have made the necessary corrections.

Reference

1. SENDRA, SANDRA, LLORET, JAIME, MIGUEL JIMENEZ, JOSE, et al. Underwater Acoustic Modems[J]. IEEE sensors journal,2016,16(11):4063-4071. DOI:10.1109/JSEN.2015.2434890.

2. Zia, M.Y.I., Poncela, J. Otero, P. State-of-the-Art Underwater Acoustic Communication Modems: Classifications, Analyses and Design Challenges[J]. Wireless Pers Commun 116, 1325–1360 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11277-020-07431-x.

3. XU, J. L., SU, W., ZHOU, M.. Likelihood-Ratio Approaches to Automatic Modulation Classification[J]. IEEE transactions on systems, man and cybernetics, Part C. Applications and reviews: A publication of the IEEE Systems, Man, and Cybernetics Society,2011,41(4):455-469.DOI: 10.1109/TSMCC.2010.2076347.

4. WU, HAO, YUAN, YING-JUN, HUANG, ZHI-TAO, et al. APSK Modulation Recognition for DVB-S2 Using GLRT and Radius-Constellation Under Frequency Offset[J]. Wireless personal communications: An Internaional Journal,2015,82(3):1213-1224. DOI:10.1007/s11277-015-2276-7.

5. HAMEED, F., DOBRE, O.A., POPESCU, D.C.. On the likelihood-based approach to modulation classification[J]. IEEE transactions on wireless communications,2009,8(12):5884-5892. DOI:10.1109/TWC.2009.12.080883.

6. B. Kim, J Kim, H Chae, D Yoon, etal. Deep neural network-based auomatic modulationclassification technique[C].In Proc.ICTC.2016.579-582.

7. Zhou Q, Lu H, Jia L, et al. Automatic modulation classification with genetic backpropagation neural network[C] Evolutionary Computation. IEEE, 2016.

8. Meng, XP, Shang, CX, Dong, J, et al. Automatic modulation classification of noise-like radar intrapulse signals using cascade classifier[J] ETRI Journal,2021,43(6):991-1003. DOI:10.4218/etrij.2020-0338.

9. Wei Y, Fang S, Wang X. Automatic Modulation Classification of Digital Communication Signals Using SVM Based on Hybrid Features, Cyclostationary, and Information Entropy[J]. Entropy, 2019, 21(8):745. DOI:10.3390/e21080745.

10. HAMOUDA, W, HASSAN, K, DAYOUB, I, et al. Automatic modulation recognition using wavelet transform and neural networks in wireless systems[J]. EURASIP journal on advances in signal processing,2010,2010(12):532898-1-532898-13. DOI:10.1155/2010/532898.